

MARTIN LUTHER

TO

S O C I N U S :

OR, A

Serious and Affectionate ADDRESS

TO THE

HEARERS AND ADMIRERS

OF

DOCTOR PRIESTLEY.

By LOVERS of the TRUTH, as it is in JESUS.

Didst not thou sow good seed in thy field? Whence then hath it tares?

Dr. PRIESTLEY's motto to his "History of the
"Corruptions of Christianity."

*It is our duty to speak, and write (if we can) as well as live, against
the enemies of our Christian faith.*—Dr. Young's "Centaur."

B I R M I N G H A M.

PRINTED AND SOLD BY PEARSON AND ROLLASON,

MDCCLXXXIII.

MARTIN LUTHER

THE NEW YORK

GENEAL AND ANCESTRAL RECORDS

OF THE

NEW YORK AND ADJACENT

DOCTOR L. L. N.



OF THE NEW YORK AND ADJACENT

THE NEW YORK AND ADJACENT GENEALOGICAL SOCIETY

OF THE NEW YORK AND ADJACENT GENEALOGICAL SOCIETY

THE NEW YORK AND ADJACENT GENEALOGICAL SOCIETY

NEW YORK AND ADJACENT

MARTIN LUTHER

T O

S O C I N U S.

Friends and Fellow-Mortals,

FINDING the blessedness of Gospel-Salvation for our own souls, we feel ourselves tenderly concerned for yours. To promote yours, we write to you. And what we write, we earnestly entreat you, for your own good, your greatest good, particularly to read, and seriously, as fairly, to examine. We write, not to grieve, but to profit you; desiring to breathe the same spirit as the Apostle, who said, in his epistle to the Corinthians, "I write not these things to *spare* you, but as beloved sons, I *warn* you." You are deeply interested in the subject. God give you to weigh it, according to its importance, and your great concern in it! We have no doubt, but are thoroughly persuaded, you are greatly mistaken, yea, sadly deluded, in an article of the last moment, namely, your *religion*: and this affects your eternal state. And we are as much persuaded, that this is owing to the *teacher* you sit under, and by whom you are so fatally led astray: Therefore we address you on the subject of his teaching. We remark, that it is not only openly from the pulpit, but more publicly from the press, he publishes the fatal system of his, and your religion. And you seem to hear, and to read what he says, with as much fondness and earnestness, as he speaks and writes. His publications are open to us as to you; and what he so avowedly proclaims, we may as strictly examine. To do this is our present purpose. And in accomplishing it, we will,

1. Remark and examine *what doctrines* your minister teaches; and then lay before you,
2. The *awful consequence* of such teaching.

Concerning the first of these particulars, we remark, in the first place,

1. That the everlasting welfare of the soul is, of all important concerns, the most important. No care is to be compared to that, which relates to this most interesting matter. Your concern here is for *eternity*. Solemn word! But, Sirs, have you, as sinners, *any souls at all*, to be cared for, and to be saved? If you believe what your teacher says, and understand what he means, you must believe you have *none*. He appears expressly and avowedly to teach, that man has no spiritual part in him, distinct from the body, to live in a conscious

B

state

state, after death, in another world. Man, with him, and as characterized by him, is *all matter*, and *no spirit*. (See his "Institutes;" his "Disquisitions;" and his "History of the "Corruptions of Christianity"). This your minister tells you: Will you believe him? If so, what need has he to persuade you, and you to attend to such and such faith, or to such and such practice, when on neither one, nor the other, any lasting concern depends? And, indeed, it is pretty observable, that in none of his publications does the Doctor appear with that earnestness to labour the point of people's caring for their eternal welfare, as do those ministers, who, in distinction from his heterodoxy, are maintainers of orthodoxy; and in distinction from his self-righteous form, are faithful preachers of the evangelical power of godliness. This is consistent. But, by this means, we are led to remark to you, that he opens to you, and to others, a wide door of soul-neglect, which may well follow the soul's non-existence. Thousands, without such teaching, live as if they believed that they had no souls at all here, or any which would exist in an eternal state hereafter: and though these sinners do not *want*, yet they *have* a good helping hand from your teacher: and where they are already, his path will lead you. "Wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be that go *in thereat*," we are told already; but lest the one should not be wide, and the other broad *enough*, the Doctor makes an addition to the width and the breadth.—To say no more, we only ask you, whether the *scriptures* teach what he teaches, unless wrested and perverted, as his manner is, being unlearned and unstable, to wrest them to his own, and your own, and others destruction?

2. In the next place, we observe, that your minister teaches, what is as good as, or rather what is as bad as this, and what may be coupled with it, that there is *no devil*, and *no hell*. (See the above-named publications). Here, Sirs, is another wide, very wide door opened for to let you, and other sinners in; a door which shuts sin in, and salvation out. Surely, there must be a hell, where else could such a door be made? And a devil, who else could make it?—But, friends, notice, we beg of you, the consequence of such doctrine. Many profligate abandoned mortals, slaves to sin, profess they believe, "there is neither God nor devil." We remark, these miserable men are helped *one* half way in their creed by your teacher; and why cannot they be helped the *other* half by him, and so receive from his ingenuity the completing of the whole Piece? For we see not, but that, if the Doctor has ability and dexterity of interpretation sufficient to shew from the scripture, that there is *no devil*, he may as easily shew, from the same fountain of instruction, that there is *no God*. And he that can demonstrate there is *no hell*, may demonstrate there is *no heaven*. (And what proof can the Doctor bring that there

there is such a place as heaven ?) For, if the word *Satan*, or *evil*, means not a *bad* being, the word *God*, or *Lord*, may not mean a *good* one ; and if the word *hell* means no *bad* place, the word *heaven* may mean no *good* one (and then, in case there is no God, what becomes of the Doctor's *Deity*, or *Supreme Being* ?) And we add too, that he who can prove that there are no *evil* spirits (for the Doctor denies that there ever were such *fallen angels* as St. Peter and St. Jude speak of ; but says, these were the *spies*, sent from the wilderness to spy the land of *Canaan*) may, being an ingenious expositor, when his hand is in, at the same time, and from the same authority, prove there are no *good* ones ; and so, at one stroke, rob the saints of their angels, and rid the sinners of their devils ; these of their comforts, and those of their fears. " O rare Doctor, may the latter say, well done, go on ; for we need not mind now how we live in what is called *sin*, for there is no hell to go to ; and we need not be afraid of the devil, for there is none to catch us." — But, Sirs, we ask, what can we, or you, possibly think that book, the *bible*, to be, which gives us so clear accounts and various descriptions of the devil (and all consistent too) when, in fact, there is no such spirit ; and of the eternal torments of the damned in hell, when there is no such state, and no such beings ? Surely, it will follow, will it not ? that there can be no such God as we have been used to look upon our God to be, from whom such a book can come. And the scriptures cannot be a divine revelation, but some poor strange human composition. Indeed, this particular leads us to observe,

3. That the bible, one would think, being led by your teacher to think, cannot be a revelation to be trusted (not, however, in his estimation of it) when we observe, that the books, which we call *inspired*, are represented by him, as if they were *un-inspired*, *not written by inspiration*. For, not to mention in what a slight manner, and in what ambiguous, equivocal terms, he speaks of the holy scriptures, respecting our dependence upon them, as infallible, in his " *Institutes*," &c. and more openly, and less equivocally, in his " *History of the Corruptions of Christianity* ;" We see, that in his " *catechism for children and young persons*," he puts this question, " What is the bible ?" and the answer is, " the bible is a collection of books, written by *good men*." And in his sermon, preached, printed, and sold in Birmingham, soon after his first coming to it, speaking of the scriptures, he says, they contain the history of all the dispensations of God to mankind, the pious sentiments of men devoted to God, and honoured by him." &c. And in his sermon, entitled, " *The Doctrine of Divine Influence on the human Mind*," he repeatedly calls the writers of the scriptures only " *pious writers*." This is the lessening way, Sirs, in which the Doctor speaks, when he describes those sacred books, which

one apostle says, are *given by inspiration of God*; and another, that *holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost*. Whilst we believe this apostolical account of the sacred volume, we may trust the whole of it; but if the Doctor's account be the true one, can we trust any part of it? Any mere good men, who write good books, are but fallible, and the Holy Ghost alone is infallible; the compositions of the first to be examined, altered, and rectified; those of the latter to be read, left unaltered, and believed; else the over-wise creature (becoming wise above what is written) may presume to declare he has detected, and then proceed to rectify the errors of the Creator. Here, in this case, the Doctor should draw the lines for us; and he, concluding himself in understanding to be the superior of the Apostles, should tell us what parts are fallible, and what infallible; lest, when we imagine we are trusting the writers in the latter view, we may actually be misleading ourselves with the former. We add too, that if your teacher believes so much, if not the whole of the scriptures to be fallible, and what, for that reason, may not be depended upon for divine truth, why does he, or why need he take so much pains as he does, to interpret them in his own way; that is, as he thinks, in the one true meaning, and then labour to force that interpretation on us? Because, sayings which are very dubious, and of suspicious authority, or false in themselves, need not, and ought not to be urged on any of us; and, as undoubted truths, they cannot. And if we, being determined to admit of no pretended revealed religion, but what, with our pre-conceived ideas of the fitness of things, we look upon as a *rational* one, may insist on the right to reject what our *reason* may make us think we see cause to disapprove of, then it will follow, that the foolishness of the Creator may be discovered by the wisdom of the creature; and so the mistakes of the former may be rectified by the latter: and then also, we think it will follow, as a strange, and till now unheard of, and perhaps unthought of notion, even by the wisest of us all, that the Creator has, for once, if not oftener, missed the matter, and over-shot the mark, by making *man*, a *creature*, of a superior judgment and understanding to *himself*, the *Creator*; and sent this wonderfully-wise being into the world, amongst other things, to examine, new-model, and amend his own imperfect productions. How can these consequences be avoided, if the writers of the sacred books are, in some things quite right, but in others, may be quite wrong? — This leads us to another observation of what your teacher tells us, relative to what may, or may not be revealed, and be depended on, and which is,

4. That man's *reason* is sufficient to guide him in spiritual matters; and is the one fit judge, whether such and such proposed doctrines, as taught in the scriptures, are to be believed, and received, or not. (See his "Appeal.")

Here

Here then, Sirs, at one stroke, go all that real Christians are taught, and all that they find to be true, respecting the divine teaching of the *Holy Spirit*. But, in what part of the scriptures, on the supposition that the Doctor believes them to be true, does he say that this is taught? And in what parts do the sacred writers teach, that the Holy Spirit cannot, and must not be depended upon, as teaching us the sense of the words, who taught the words themselves? That the Spirit of God is to teach, and that he alone can teach, the Application and true sense of his word, is clearly taught in some places, and taken for granted in all, is as plain as plain can be: (See, particularly, 1 Cor. ii.) but in what parts is this as plainly contradicted? That in some parts of the scripture we are taught, that man is spiritually blind, is very clear; but in what other parts have the writers as plainly told us, that they mistook this matter, and the truth is, man can see, his eyes are good, they are not blind? The Doctor should shew this, or he fails in his argument. If a man has a spirit within him equal, if not superior to the Spirit of God, he may then say yes, or no, as he pleases, to what God takes upon him to propose; and may give for answer to any particular matter urged upon him, "God is my equal, if not my superior, and I shall not be dictated to by him." But where is this taught? If the Doctor cannot shew, he fails again.—We go on to remark, that as your minister teaches you, that man has a spirit within him sufficient to guide him, and be his own judge, in matters revealed from God; and therefore needs not the divine teaching of the Holy Spirit, so,

5. Has he *power* in himself to do the will of God. (See the Appeal) Then God need not have offered his. Grace might have been spared, if nature will do. And here the inspired writers have exposed themselves again, and shewn their fallibility indeed: for they teach the sufficiency of grace, and the insufficiency of human nature, for whatever good is to be done. We wonder not at the Doctor's saying, that the Apostles were not right in *every punctilio*. These punctilios are so many, so thick, and so plain in the scriptures, that he that runs may read them; and whilst the Doctor, with his national spectacles, reads them, and finds them corruptions, we, with our glasses, read them, and find them pure energetic truths. He that can see, that the branch *can* bear fruit itself, though it does not abide in the vine, though our Lord says it *cannot*, and that St. Paul meant *without* Christ strengthening me, I can do all things, though he said, *through*, we see indeed. Those see aright, who see this, if what the Doctor says be true. Man has power in himself to do the will of God, to be virtuous and good, and so to procure God's favour, and God's heaven. And as man has, it seems, power to reclaim himself, the wonder now is, not that the *saemër* converted the Apostle of the Gentiles, but that the

Apostle did not convert *himself*. To which we add, how observable afterwards, in some distant period from his conversion, is this same Apostle's mistake, "It is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy:" for he meant the contrary.—But, keeping our eyes, and yours, on the scriptures, and keeping your teachers on the same object, we go on to take notice, that, on a profession of his belief in what is there written, he denies,

6. That the Son of God was *equal* to his Father in the God-head; but teaches that he was a *mere man*, a *mortal creature* (See the "Appeal.") This is one of the Doctor's *corruptions*; what he calls a *material*, a *great*, a most *absurd* corruption, an *impious Doctrine*, which at present *deforms, disgraces, defiles, and confines* the Church*.

To this teaching of his, of the mere humanity of Christ, and denial of his divinity, we answer, if this be the truth of the case, why then is Christ called and described in the scriptures, as GOD, *Jehovah*, the Lord, the Lord of Hosts, *Immanuel*, I AM, the *first*, and the *last*, &c. Why is worship paid him? Prayer made to him? Why are believers baptized into his name, as well as into the Father's? (Is not this baptism an act of adoration?) Why are divine attributes and perfections ascribed to him, to which none but God can have a title? Things said by him, that none but Jehovah, as such, could say? Works done by him, which none but Jehovah could do? With other particulars, all plainly demonstrative of Godhead; and yet, all this time, and after all this, Christ is not God, but a human being only, like to, though better than ourselves; a mere mortal creature! Here, we must ask you, Sirs, What must a man of a plain understanding, and a fair enquiring mind, make of the book of God, if no more than what your minister says of Christ, be true of him? How can he possibly think, that it is revealed by the wisdom of God? And what can he look upon the bible to be, but a book full of artfully contrived doctrines to perplex, or of ambiguous words to beguile, and therefore full of traps to catch, instead of truths to guide the fair reader? Surely, a subtle foe, and not a trusty friend, a secret hater, and not an open-hearted lover of mankind, has palmed the bible upon the world.—But, if Christ was but a *mere man*, what sort of a man could he be but a *sinful* one? And were not the Jews and Pharisees right, (in John ix.) who said of him, "We know that this man is a *sinner*?" And were not the devils wrong, when they said, "We know thee, who thou art, the

* The Doctor has lately published two volumes, entitled, "An History of the Corruptions of Christianity." To which title, we fancy, no real Christian, that has a right knowledge of inspired and uninspired history will object, provided that after the words, "An History of," and before the words, "Corruptions of Christianity," there be inserted, *his own*.

"*Holy One of God?*" And was not Ananias also wrong, when he called Christ "*that Just One?*" But will you, or your teacher say this? Can you, or he, prove this? Can you disprove the judgment of the Jews and Pharisees, and the devils, and Ananias? But you must do both one and the other of these; because it is undeniable, that the scriptures speak of no mere man, but what is a sinner. And Jesus spake right, in every view, when he said to the young man, "Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God." And his enemies spake right, in their view, when they said, "We did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted;" that is, as a sinner for his own sins.—Further, if Christ was a mere mortal, who was his father? Mortals are begot by mortals. Who then begat Christ! Mary was with child before Joseph and she came together. And how could he be born of a *virgin*? No children are born of *virgins*.—Besides, if the Doctor denies the divinity of the *Son*, we would ask him, how he proves the divinity of the *Father*? For, in our bible, plainly revealed, and plainly understood, and as taken together, scripture being compared with scripture, it is very evident, that the same things, which demonstrate the latter, demonstrate the former. And again, we cannot but remark, how amazing it is, that if we may be allowed to call that person a *man*, to whom peculiar and distinguishing properties, and essential qualities are ascribed, as *human*; yet, at the same time, we must not call that being, GOD, to whom peculiar and distinguishing properties, and essential qualities are ascribed, as *divine*! — Once more, we say, that if Christ, the Saviour, was but a mere creature, and so a finite, imperfect mortal; of what greater value was, or could be, his death, as an atonement for sin, than would have been the death of his fellow-mortals and creatures, Paul, or Peter, or Martin Luther, or any ministering servant of God? Is a mere man to be depended upon by a penitent sinner, who feels what sin is, for salvation from it? Would Paul depend on Peter, and Peter on Paul, as each other's saviour? Would the trembling jailer have been satisfied, and discharged of his soul-distress, had the Apostle said, "Believe on *us*, and thou shalt be saved?" And do the scriptures speak of Christ's death, in no more extraordinary senses and circumstances, than of the death of any of his followers? See, and then say. And who can believe this?

To what we have here briefly said, with a view to shew you, and the Doctor, the strangeness of denying the deity of the Son of God, we have only to add, that before you and he proceed any further in that denial, please to read the "*Short Defence*" of this doctrine (second edition) written against what the Doctor has advanced, in his *Appeal*, and in his *Fa-
vourable Illustration*, to overturn it, by an able hand, Mr. H—, of Leeds, in Yorkshire. Answer this, and you will convince

convince us. ——— But the mention of Christ's death, as an *atonement* or *sacrifice* for *sin*, to the justice of God, and as bearing the *curse* of the *law*, and doing this for us in our room and stead, leads us.

7. To speak now of this, as a *capital doctrine*, which your minister is a professed, strenuous *opposer* of, but which we are as earnest *contenders* for (See his *Appeal* and *History of Corruptions*). This doctrine, with the Doctor, is a *horrid corruption* of Christianity, a *modern thing*, a *novel doctrine*, an *innovation*, and a *Popish invention*. Your teacher avowedly and professedly contends, that it was not the intention of Christ to die, and by his death, as a sacrifice, to make any satisfaction to the justice of God for our sins, but only to assure us of a future life, and our resurrection to it, and as an example of patient suffering and submission to the will of his Father, and as a martyr in the glorious cause of virtue, confirming his own doctrine with his own blood. What then, like as we observed before, must a man of a plain understanding, and a fair enquiring mind, make of the bible, which speaks expressly of *atonement*, *ransom*, *propitiation*, *price*, *offering for sin*, *died for our sins*, *redemption through his blood*, *bear our sins*, *bought with a price*, *purchased with his blood*, *putting away sin by the sacrifice of himself*, made a *curse* for us, &c. Must his plain understanding suffer such imposition by interpretations of a teacher, which interpret away the common sense of common words? What must he think of the nature and design of the phraseology of the scriptures? And what must this honest man say, when he reads the account of Christ's sufferings in the 53d chapter of Isaiah? Can he possibly believe them to be, what the Doctor says they are, the sufferings only of any *good man* in *like circumstances*? (But what other good man ever was there in the like circumstances?) And when he reads the accounts of Christ's death, in the Gospels, can he say, this is only the death of a common sufferer? What! Was the agony in the garden, the treatment at the trial, and the cry on the cross, the feelings only of a mere brother in Christ, occasioned by nothing uncommon with him, but what was common to others? Could all this be any thing but a most severe punishment for *sin*? And did Christ suffer, to satisfy his Father for his *own* sins? Were they right, his enemies, who said, "We did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted," for *his* sins? And were they, his friends, wrong, who said, "But he was wounded for *our* transgressions; he was bruised for *our* iniquities." Were the immediate circumstances, and immediate consequences of the death of the Son of God, the darkening of the sun, the rent of the vail, the rending of the rocks, the quaking of the earth, the opening of the graves, the rising of the saints,—were these striking prodigies, like the common circumstances and consequences of the exit of a common

common martyr for Christ's sake?—We add, and what can this same honest-minded man think and say, when he reads about the nature and use of the various sacrifices under the *law*, and, after this, reads the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, but, at once discover, that they represented what the Redeemer fulfilled, his own death, as a sacrifice for sin, by a vicarious punishment? What could he call the first but types, and the other but anti-types? Such must be the acceptation, which these scriptural accounts of Christ's death will meet with, when read by the unlearned, as well as learned readers. The Doctor allows, to use his own words, that “the lower class of people are as capable of judging concerning the important truths of religion, as the most learned.” But how can this be? How can he admit this, when he so imposes upon their understanding, and interprets away that sense of the scriptures, which their plain senses are capable of receiving, and do receive? And why does he send them to the *original*, and not confine them to the English *translation*? But it may yet be observed, that what the Doctor says about the capability of the common people to understand the scriptures, when they speak of the important truths of religion, is very true; and they can see, and also prove his errors, and his corruptions of Christianity. But, to add a word or two more, relative to the Doctor's manner of interpreting away the plain sense of plain scriptures, which describe the death of Christ, as a propitiatory sacrifice for sin, we would ask, whether text, or context, sense, and other scriptures, can afford him the least fair plea in the world, to do away the evident meaning of the above quoted expressions, by his calling them “bold figures of speech, figurative expressions, allegories, metaphors,” &c. This man might say, and he would have good cause for saying, “If I lose all this in a figure, I may lose *heaven* in a figure; as the Saviour may be but a *figurative* saviour, his salvation may be but a *metaphorical* salvation; and then what becomes of my soul? *That*, I am sure, is no figure; And what will become of my sins? *They*, I feel, are no metaphors?” To speak earnestly—the Doctor lay on his bed, wreathing his body for agony, a fit of the stone or cholic, would it relieve him to remark, this is only a figurative pain? Or, to speak jocosely—If he were to have his house burnt down, would it prove as good as building it again, to remark to him, The fire, Doctor, is only a figure? Or, if a highwayman took his purse, the robbery was only a bold metaphor? Or, the thief, who stole a watch, displayed only an allegorical theft, and the thief must only be hung on a metaphorical gallows? We mention these particulars, in this jocular strain, only to shew the Doctor his folly, when he endeavours, with the dextrous lies of his pen, and the artful language of his tongue, to sound away the serious, and plain sense of the inspired writers,

writers, when they treat upon the subject of the end of Christ's death. After which we would not omit to remark, that one of the *answers* to the Doctor's *Appeal*, is entitled (and very properly) "An Appeal to the *common sense* of plain " and *common* Christians, in behalf of the old Christianity of " the Gospel." This title itself, in our judgment, without the contents in the book itself, is almost, if not quite, answer sufficient to the Doctor's interpretations of the scripture account of the design of the Redeemer's sufferings. And now, to what we have said, we have only to add this word of advice, both to you and to him, That before either of you open your mouths again to speak of Christ's death, in the mere figurative stile, and so to do away the one grand design of it, please to read a pamphlet, which the above-mentioned gentleman in Yorkshire has put forth, in answer to the Doctor's arguments against Christ's death being an atonement for sin, entitled, "A short defence of the doctrine of atonement for " sin by the death of Christ." And of the last, so of this performance we say, Answer this, and you will convince us.

8. As your minister labours to do away the grand and one meaning of the death of the *second* person in the Trinity, so we observe him acting to the like purpose relative to the office of the *third* person, in his denying the *personality* and *operations* of the *Holy Ghost*. This point we have spoken to before; and therefore we are satisfied with only mentioning it here; purposing only, by this manner of mentioning it in this place, that it may be noticed as a capital doctrine, interpreted away by the Doctor.—And now having briefly remarked, and having briefly objected against *what doctrine* your minister teaches, we proceed, as we proposed, in the next place, by way of making further objections against them,

2. To consider the *awful consequences* of such teaching.—And awful indeed they are, respecting the Doctor *himself*.

For, when we consider the number of years, in which he has persisted to maintain the heterodox, soul-ruining cause, and also his remaining unchanged in his principles and practices, after all that has been, by able and godly men, written against him; and, when, along with this, we reflect, with what effrontery he still goes on, openly and avowedly, to propagate his pernicious scheme, as if no pen had been ever taken in hand, or mouth opened against him, as a man past feeling himself, or being made to feel by others; what can we be ready to conclude, but that he seems to be *given up* of God, as an invincible enemy to the cross of Christ*;

* In the title-page of the *Appeal*, the Doctor calls himself "a lover of " the Gospel." When we are in the enquiring mood, we say, *What Gospel?* Christ's, or Socinus's? When we speak in a jocular strain, we say, The Doctor means, the Gospel turned upside down, or what St. Paul calls, "another Gospel." When we indulge to irony, we suppose he means a *hater* of it; when we are for answering, we say, We know the man; and when we are for rebuking sharply, we say, Behold, a *Jesuit*.

who has justly and judicially sent him strong delusion, that he should believe a lie, his own lies, and had given him the gift of slumber, eyes that he should not see; and so he that ~~sees~~ and *says*, "I see," as the Pharisees, the enemies of Christ of old, should be made blind. And as Elymas the sorcerer was struck blind by the hand of the Lord upon him, as one, "full of all subtilty, and all mischief, a child of the devil, an enemy of all righteousness, who would not ~~be~~ *use* to pervert the right ways of the Lord, withstanding the Apostle, and seeking to turn away the Deputy from the Faith;" so, what is there in this language inapplicable and unsuitable for your teacher; whilst, at the same time, the corporal blindness of this foe to the truth of God, figures out to us the more awful blindness, with which the eyes of his understanding are darkened? And what has the Doctor done, and is doing, but exhibiting, in his own person, by his own conduct, an awful verifying of those awful scriptures of God, written, 2 Tim. iii. 13. Heb. x. 26—31. 2 Pet. ii. 1, 2. and some others such-like? We dare not, we want not, we would not positively pronounce thus upon your teacher, but express, as we have cause, our fearful apprehensions, and dreadful expectations concerning him. He maintains in his own views, and teaches others, that there is no hell, as the scriptures, untortured, speak of it; but may he reflect upon, what we are afraid of, that an insulted God may make him feel in person, what he denies in word, and convince him of it, like many others, not till he is in it? Sure we are, for writers, inspired of God, have told us, speaking of the deluder, "The devil that deceived them, was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where the beast and the FALSE PROPHET are, and shall be tormented, day and night, for ever," Rev. xx. 10. And St. Peter, speaking of "*false prophets*," who privily bring in damnable heresies," says, "They bring upon themselves swift DESTRUCTION, and their DAMNATION slumbereth not," 2 Pet. ii. St. Paul declares the *end* of the "enemies of the cross of Christ" to be DESTRUCTION: and he, in 2 Cor. xi. speaking of "false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the Apostles of Christ," being, as he describes them, "Satan's ministers," declares that their "*end* shall be according to their works." Who can read these solemn texts, and not think and then tremble for your minister? This is the end he meets, and such the punishment, we fear, he will meet with; yet it is what we wish him to escape. He hesitates not to say, that there is no devil. That he, who denies there is here, may not meet with one hereafter, we wish to be "delivered, that he may learn not to blaspheme, Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that his spirit may be saved in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ."—

Then

Then he will find one here ; and, so, none hereafter. And therefore, whilst with hearts that bleed, and hands that tremble, we cast before him such awful scriptures as the above, we would, at the same time, with hearts bleeding with love, and hands quite lifted up, and earnestly stretched out, fling him out, before he is quite sunk and gone to rise no more, as a rope to catch at (if so be, through God's most marvellous forgiving mercy, he may yet be saved from drowning in the lake, which burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the second death) one that is most likely to save him, in Matt. xii. 31. with Mark iii. 28. " All manner of sin and " **BLASPHEMIES**, against the Son of Man, wherewith- " soever they shall blaspheme, shall be **FORGIVEN** unto the " sons of men." All hope of his being yet saved is not utterly, and for ever gone : seeing there is, what rejoices our very souls to see, a difference between blasphemy against the *second*, and that against the *third* Person in the Holy Trinity ; the former pardonable, the latter unpardonable. With the like view it is, and to shew our cordial desire to rescue him from destruction (for our hearts desire and prayer to God for him is, that he may be saved ; and we would remember, for his encouragement, and our own, that the Apostle says, " Bre- " thren, if any of you do err from the truth, and one convert " him, let him know, that he which converteth a sinner from " the error of his way, shall save a soul from death, and shall " hide a multitude of sins.") We fling him out another rope, hoping he may, sooner or later, catch hold of it ; " If " any man see his brother sin a sin which is not unto death, " he shall ask, and he shall give him life for them that sin " not unto death. There is a sin unto death, I do not say " he shall pray for it. All unrighteousness is sin : and there " is a sin not unto death," 1 John v. 16, 17. Hoping that the Doctor's sin is that which is not unto death, we do earnestly pray our God to give him grace to see it, and savingly to repent of it. Our wish being, not to send him into, but to keep him from destruction, and being very unwilling to count him as an enemy, but heartily willing to admonish him as a brother, we exhort him to ponder the above scriptures ; and with the like aim that we wish him to read the grand inspired book, we wish him also to read an uninspired, but a very affecting one, entitled, " The Arian's and the Socinian's Mo- " nitor ;" with the desire, not that he may read a solemn representation of his fate, but a striking admonition to warn him against it, that he may avoid it.

2. The next consequence, we observe, of your minister's manner of teaching, respecting himself, is one that is peculiarly *mortifying* both to him, and to his admirers ; in that, his interpretations of the scriptures are such, as that they afford us an undeniable display of the impaired state of his *senses*, or rather, as appears, the *great poverty* of his *understanding*.

ending. When we read the Doctor's philosophical publications, we see the man of sense ; but when we read his scriptural ones, we see the boy at school, a mere novice. When he lectures us upon electricity, perspective, fixed air, &c. he shines ; but when he lectures us in divinity, he is beclouded, and enveloped in darkness. Here his poor abilities are exposed indeed. As a professor of *philosophy*, we give our vote for him (provided he does not spoil us through and vain deceit) ; but as a professor of *divinity*, we cannot. The first we wish him to go on with, but the other we wish him to let alone. A seat in the schools is a seat for the professor, but not a stand in the pulpit. For, if a man of professed literary education, can deliberately, and after long study, allow himself to maintain, and actually publish for the inspection of the learned world, as the Doctor really has done, in the following observable, and very remarkable instances, viz. That when Thomas expresses his faith in the Lord Christ, and, in his adorable acknowledgment of his deity, cries out with holy rapture, " My LORD, and my GOD," he only gives such an idle *abrupt exclamation* (as the Doctor calls it) as the prophane do ; when, upon every turn almost, they are so apt to express their surprize, by saying, " O Lord, O God ; Lord have mercy upon us."—That when the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah gives us an account of the sufferings of the Redeemer, as a sacrifice for sin, it only gives us an account of the sufferings of *any good man* ;—That when St. Peter says, " The devil is like a roaring lion, going up and down, seeking whom he may devour," he means only *Nero*, the *Roman Emperor*, or some other *known adversary*, or *accuser* ;—That when St. Peter and St. Jude speak of the fallen angels, that sinned, &c. they mean, probably, the *messengers*, who were sent from the *wilderness*, to lay out the land of *Canaan* ;—That when St. Paul expresses his having a desire to go to the Thessalonians, but that " Satan hindered him," he might mean any *human adversary*, or some of his *friends*, influenced by *worldly considerations* ;—That when the same Apostle says, in Phil. ii. that Christ, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God," he means (so strangely in itself, and so inconsistent with the context) that Christ was far from thinking of such an *impious robbery*, as that of being equal with God ; (the Doctor saying, it was an impious robbery, the apostle, that it was no robbery at all) ;—And that which may be really meant by Jesus being " tempted by the devil," in Matt. iv. may be that the *improper thoughts* (as the Doctor calls them) mentioned in the course of the narrative, either occurred to *himself*, in his *private meditations*, or were suggested by some *other person* ;—That when the wicked and vicious die, as such, they go some where (but who can tell where?) and are punished, and, in a sort of purgatory, are

purified and made better, in order to be virtuous, and so to be good, and happy for ever: We say, that when we see the Doctor can exhibit, for the examination of the public, such foreign interpretations of the holy scriptures, as these are, and others such like, that we see not only the wretched shifts, the ignorant and hard-driven expositor is put to, in order to maintain his uncouth system, but we discern plainly the exposure he affords of the *smallness* of his *abilities*, as to his understanding of spiritual subjects. So true is it, that God “destroys the wisdom of the wise, and brings to nothing the understanding of the prudent; and he taketh the wise in their own craftiness.” What a laugh must this afford to a man of sense, and what a grief to a man of charity! After this, who in the world can trust the Doctor, as an interpreter of scripture? He must now be, both as a preacher and a writer, always suspected, closely watched, and narrowly searched, when he offers to expound the scriptures, as a mere novice, or empiric in religion. Can we trust a man, who professes himself an apothecary, who is only a smatterer in medical knowledge, and but a dabbler in medicine, and in making up the physicians prescriptions, has been guilty of many capital blunders? If we do, we must thank ourselves, more than blame him, whose judgment we have sufficient cause to mistrust, if we take deadly poison instead of healing medicine, and so find his word eating as doth a canker, and not, as it ought, curing that destructive malady. Yet this, Sirs, *this* is the man, to whom you hearken, as your interpreter of the scriptures, in matters of the very greatest importance, in concerns momentous to the last degree. This is the unskilful practitioner, whom you make choice of, as the physician of your souls.

3. A third solemn consequence, respecting the Doctor himself, which follows from his principles and teachings, is, what he little thinks of, but which is as great in its truth, as it is little in his thought, viz. That he teaches *idolatry*, and is himself an *idolater*. He has the face to call our worship “idolatrous and blasphemous;” because we serve (as he says) more Gods than one. But, this is not true. This we deny professedly, and openly. As for the Church of England, her Members say, “We are *forbidden*, by the Catholic religion, to say, there be three Gods.” Again, “They are *not* three Gods, but one God.” Our God is Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Three *persons*, not three *Gods*; one God only. Yet the three Persons are divine. This is the mystery to be believed; because it is the scripture account of Jehovah; and therefore we have scriptural worship. We, as Trinitarians, are true worshippers of the one true God; but you, and your teacher, as Unitarians, are worshippers of a *false* God: for you worship a God of your own making, and not of the bible’s revealing. You think of God, as he

does not think of himself; and speak of God, as he does not speak of himself. But surely, his own account of himself, in his scripture character, is the right one, and not the unscriptural one of the Doctor's. If there be common sense in common words, and which may be comprehended by men of common understandings, the bible describes our triune Jehovah to be three persons, but one God, yet each person divine and adorable. But this is not the God, which the Doctor worships, but his is *another* God; and therefore he is an idolater, and a real breaker of the first commandment, which says, "Thou shalt have no *other* Gods before me." And, consequently, like the Athenians of old, he may set up an altar, with this inscription, "To the *unknown* God," whom he ignorantly worships. And how the Doctor can free himself from the charge of his being as real an idolater as the Jew, the Turk, or the Pagan (all of whom worship *one* God, to the exclusion of the Son, and the Spirit) our understandings cannot comprehend; but we can comprehend, that a Unitarian is no better than a Jew, a Turk, or a Pagan. We would go on to observe, that the Doctor says, we Trinitarians are idolaters, and have no better than idolatrous worship. But will the Doctor say, that thousands and thousands of God's faithful servants, martyrs for the truth, ministers, and others, in the Christian church, in every age, men of sense and learning too, as well as of grace (all Trinitarians) have mistaken the object of their worship; and after all their studious pains in searching of the scriptures, with prayer for the divine teaching of the Spirit, have never been able to understand, who, and what that Being is, who is adorable; and have all their lives been idolatrous worshippers? We ask your teacher, and you, how you all account for this? And what must we think of your God, that Divine Person, whom you call, *Father*, and represent as a God of *love*, and whom the Doctor calls "the most compassionate Father of all his offspring," and whose mercies cover all his works, who yet has permitted this idolatrous worship to his own dishonour, and left all these his servants to live, and also to die in this state of sinful idolatry; and, with the bible in their hands, expressly teaching them by it, that it is a false, and what alone is the true worship of the one true God? And, additionally to this, we ask, Are they guilty of idolatry in *heaven*, where they worship the Lamb, as they worship the Father; daring to worship the creature with the same worship, and in the very face of the Creator? Are Saints and Angels there, all idolaters? If so, what becomes of St. Paul's repeated declarations, that "idolaters shall not inherit the kingdom of God?" Declarations these, alarming to the Doctor, respecting his own future state, contradictory to the conclusion of his doctrine, that the worshipping of Christ is idolatry.

4. One other particular, as a consequence of your minister's teaching, and which relates to himself, in a very disheartening point of view, is, the great *disappointment* met with in the *acceptance* of his services paid to, and as expected to be received by God the *Father*. The Doctor professes great reverential regard to the *Father*, speaks highly of him, and adorably to him; and appears to apprehend not the least disapprobation, or refusal of such services. But here he is greatly mistaken. Here is a terrible disappointment. He has a zeal for God; but, to speak the best of it, it is a zeal not according to knowledge. God the Father accounts himself, not honoured, as the unitarian worshipper expects, but dishonoured, as the truth of the matter is, by such a person with such a service. For, if he sees his Son degraded, he cannot see himself exalted. Were we to see our sons scandalized, could we possibly imagine ourselves honoured? Shall the man, who despises my children, tell me he loves me? To prove what we say, we bring three or four particular scriptures: and we believe the Doctor's dexterity at interpretation cannot figure away their plain and true meaning; viz. our Lord's words, in John v. 17—23. and xv. 23. His servant's, St. Paul, 2 Tim. ii. 12. and his servant's, St. John, 1 epistle, ii. 23. and 2 John verse 9. The Doctor thinks that the Father is a lover of him, and himself a lover of the Father; but these plain scriptures plainly teach, that they are haters, and not lovers of one another. God, in his word, tells him this now, and will cause him to find it so hereafter, unless he recants and repents. We would here just mention, amongst the solemn consequences of your minister's teaching, that there is one respecting the *nation*. The concern is a *national* one; the cause a *public* cause, respecting *Great Britain*. The spread of infidelity, in various shapes and degrees, of late years has been, and is now, rapid; and the people of the land, in their solemn days of fasting, have acknowledged this as one of the *national sins*, and have deprecated the judgments of God respecting it. According, then, to our own acknowledgments, what can we expect, if the infidel spirit continues, and increases, but to find it will bring on *national ruin*! The doctrines of the established Church are denied; and what does this lead to, but the overthrow of the Church; and if the ecclesiastical state goes, the civil will go: as it has been, so it will be; they will stand or fall together. And we would further observe, that we are plainly taught in the scriptures, to fear this ruin, when we there read, that the Jewish Church and Polity were destroyed for the same sin, which now threatens ours, namely, the *rejection* of the Son of God. This is written for our learning. O that we may learn from it, and be wise in time! To this we would add another thought, respecting your teacher, namely, What an *enemy* to his *country* must he be,

He, in his so earnestly forwarding that evil system, which directly tends to its ruin!—Such, Sirs, so particular, so true, and so exceedingly awful, are the consequences of your minister's principles, respecting himself.—And now, after all this, we earnestly entreat, and call upon you to consider; what the solemn consequences are respecting *yourselves*, by his propagating his soul-ruining principles amongst *you*. We have shewed you, and surely you cannot but see, what a pastor your shepherd is; and what is the food, with which he feeds you; or, rather, the poison with which he destroys you. And now we seriously ask you, Sirs, Will you still follow him? Still be led by him? Still hear him, and still believe him? What, when he strikes at the very foundation, labouring to undermine the Christian edifice? What, when he labours, as he has *said* he would not cease to labour, till he had banished that *idol*, *Christ*, out of the world?" What, when this his endeavour to effect this awful purpose, but a comment on those words of the prophet of old, but applicable now, "Get ye out of the way, turn aside out of the path; cause the Holy One of Israel to cease from before us." What, when you are warned by Christ himself, in one place, "Take heed *what* you hear:" in another, Beware of *false prophets*," &c. By Solomon, "Cease, my son, to hear the instruction, that causeth to err from the words of knowledge:" By St. Paul, "Though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, than that we have preached unto you, let him be accursed:" and again, "Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof; from such TURN AWAY. Beware of dogs, beware of evil-workers;" and again, "Beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy, and vain deceit," &c. and again, "A man that is an heretic*, after the first and second admonition, REJECT:" and again, "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine, which ye have learned; and AVOID them:" By St. John, "Beloved, believe not every spirit; but try the spirits, whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world:"

* That the Doctor is an heretic, and a promoter of heresy, is very clear, not only from the scripture account of such, but from this particular also, namely, that he is reviving the old exploded heresies, with which the Church of Christ was pestered and torn, in former ages, by the ancient heretics, the Ebionites, Cerinthians, Gnostics, Samaritanians, Photinians, Pelagians, and others; all of whom, and their pernicious tenets, were triumphed over, by that Church, which they themselves laboured to triumph over. An account of all which damnable heresies, and a complete answer to, and overthrow of which, may be fully seen in two particular masterly works of that truly evangelical, and as truly learned writer, in the last century, Dr. OWEN; one entitled, "Vindiciæ Evangelicæ; or, The Mystery of the Gospel vindicated, and Socinianism examined, in answer to John Biddle, the Socinian;" and the other, entitled, "An Exposition on the Epistle to the Hebrews."

and still more expressly, more strikingly, and more pertinently, by the same Apostle, "If there come any unto you, and bring not this doctrine" (that is, the true doctrine of Christ, as God, and Saviour by his atonement) "receive him not into your house, neither bid him, God speed. For he that biddeth him, God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds." What, Sirs, will you dare, in direct opposition to what the God of truth says, and when it tends to your own never ending, and never to be counted loss, to go on to regard what the man of falsity says (preaching lies in God's name) receiving his doctrine, and fondling his person? — If you follow him, where, where, we ask you, do you imagine he will lead you; Where he ventures, will you? Of old it was said, "The leaders of this people have caused them to err, and they that are led of them, are *destroyed*." Will you venture the not verifying such words now? What can you possibly be thinking of, as to suffer yourselves to be so blinded, as you are, by this guide, himself blinded? Will you not "BOTH fall into the ditch?" When both you, and your teacher, stand, at the last awful day, before the judgment-seat of Christ, all of you to give an account of yourselves to God, Will it be with you, that he will be your rejoicing, even as ye also will be his, in the day of the Lord Jesus? No, Sirs, we believe it will be the opposite. O then, think of it, before it be too late. Knowing the terrors of the Lord, we would persuade you. Let us further ask you, What evidence have you of your minister being a teacher sent of God? What are the fruits to sinners of this preacher of salvation, as you think him? The Doctor appears to wield the sword of the Spirit, and seems to fight, but what does he, but, with it, "beat the air?" The sword, then, is of his *own* making, not of the Spirit's. But what is *done* by him? How many vain, ungodly men have, by him, been turned from the error of their ways, and their souls saved from death? Can you produce yourselves, or others around you, that can tell what God has done for their souls by his ministry? Any that are seals to his ministry, and will prove his joy and crown of rejoicing in the great day of the Lord Jesus? No, you have none. But we have many. Our ministers are sent of God; and they are owned of God. We are their epistles, known and read of all men. Our ministers can, each of them, say, as St. Paul does to the Corinthians, "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel." We bless God now, and believe we shall bless him more in eternity, that we ever heard them. Now, Sirs, which ministry is it, think you, yours or ours, that the Father makes most, or any use of? To which does he give, and from which does he withhold his blessing? Therefore, we add, which is according to his mind and will? Here, Sirs, we have brought the plain and serious subject to a plain and serious point. Whether there be a failure with your

teacher in other particulars, or not, there is a great and a fatal
 here. If sinners are not converted, and so souls are not
 red, it is as clear, as it is an awful certainty, the teaching
 materially defective, yea, soul-ruining. If God gives no
 treasure, does it not look as if it was not a Paul that planted,
 an Apollos that watered? If the sheep are not called and
 does it not appear that the shepherd, so called and sup-
 posed, is but an hireling, a stranger, or a wolf, and not a
 shepherd? We speak as unto wise men; judge ye
 at we say. In this case, what then is the worth of, or,
 whether, how dreadfully destructive is your religion, and your
 teacher's? What can you do for yourselves, or what can he
 do to you, with his religion, should you come to feel hor-
 ror, because you felt your fatal mistakes on your *death bed*?
 What, for instance, would your teacher have said to dispel
 despair of the dying profligate, *Altamont*, as related by
Young, in his "Centaur?" What to the late Hon.
 N—t, whose awful death we have lately had an affect-
 ing account of in the Gospel Magazine? What to the still
 more heart-rending case of *Francis Spira*? What would he
 have said to the trembling jailer (in Acts xvi.) Not, surely,
 what the Apostle said. In these, and in such like cases,
 when the conscience is stabbed, can Socinianism heal? When
 an accuses, can the Unitarian comfort? When Heaven
 is out of sight, and hell in, can the free enquirer reverse the
 aspect? When conviction creates pangs, can self-repent-
 ance change them for applause?—O Sirs, for God's sake,
 consider the awful solemnness of such cases as these.
 Leave them upon your minds. Do not shake them off.
 But, a little more; let us ask again, what are the good
 fruits of your minister's preaching? Speaking of *false pro-*
 phets, the infallible Divine Teacher says, "Ye shall know
 them by their fruits." Yes: Our true, and your false
 fruits are, indeed, easily, and soon, and fully known. But
 what fruits are observable in your lives and conversations?
 Your instructor lifts you up very high indeed; we can see
 more plainly. He actually represents you, as "the
 most exemplary of men," whilst he charges us with "pride
 and bigotry:" and this, he says, "your enemies must
 acknowledge." Indeed your enemies do not, and cannot.
 Because it is notorious, that however moral some of you may
 be, yet numbers of the Socinians and Unitarians are loose
 in their lives, and exemplary in the love of the world, and
 vain followers of it, and earnest compliers with it, in its
 various ways; and this, the Doctor himself being judge; for
 he allows, "there is, in you Unitarians, a greater confor-
 mity to the world, than is observable in the Trinita-
 rians." This witness is true; for it is that of a prophet
 of your own. Where now, Sirs, is the honesty and consist-
 ency of your teacher, in painting this matter in such false
 colours? Is he not condemned of himself? And, we ask,

What is this, but "calling evil good, and good evil; putting "darkness for light, and light for darkness?" And what a *wo* is there denounced against such!—Again, Sirs, we say to you: What, will you yet continue to follow, and not forsake your leader? Suffer us to reason with you. And, hoping for your attention, we would say, particularly, feeling a compassionate look, as upon the present, so towards the generation beyond the present, What, will you, who are *parents*, send your *children*, your younger, or grown up sons and daughters, to be *catechetically instructed* by such an instructor, when his "Catechism for Children and young Persons," published by him for this very purpose, like the Racovian of John Biddle, is, to speak the best of it, a plain, avowed system of mere morality, self-righteousness, and legal salvation; and, to speak the worst of it, full of heterodox, antichristian, and soul-ruining doctrine? At the same time, also, we observe, the author speaks against other (orthodox, evangelical) catechisms. What, Sirs, shall the parents encourage such instruction, and the children be sent on purpose to learn it? How awful, then, is the case of the present rising generation, and how awful will be the case of the next, yea, the generations to come! Will the parents, by this means, get ready, before they are born, a road paved for their children in the broad way, to lead them to destruction, stopping up the narrow, the only true one, which would lead them to eternal life? Will your children, will "the generations to come" as you speak, and express your fervent wishes, may be the case, "will rise up, and call you blessed?" No. They will, it is to be feared, sink down in hell, and call you cursed. They shall follow the generations of their fathers, and shall never see light. O, Sirs, for the sake of your childrens' souls, as well as your own, stop, and consider what is with you, what is around you, and whither you are going. Examine, and weigh with fairness, and without prejudice, our addresses to you, and our pleadings for you. We are much moved ourselves, and would move you much. Our aim is to convince you, for your good, not to grieve you, for your hurt. Out of much affliction and anguish of heart, we have written unto you with many tears; not that you should be grieved, but that ye might know the love, which we have more abundantly to you. We are friends, acting a friendly part, not foes, acting an hostile one; and we are not your enemies, but your friends, because we tell you the truth. Yea, we are the same respecting your teacher. Of him we are ready almost to despair, but not of you. Of his being convinced, there is a possibility; not, we fear, a probability: but of you, we have hopes. God grant they may not be disappointed! May he be with you? May he give you a right understanding in all things; guiding you out of all destructive error, and into all saving truth!

g
a
ay
or-
p-
g a
ne.
ti,
nd
or,
,"
of
ved
va-
nti.
llo,
an-
ge-
ant
ene-
the
ge-
ren-
to the
ern-
me-
cale-
is to
"ley
neve-
s, a
what
and
ies to
our-
vince
ut of
unio
t that
andly
fces,
but
e are
ready
nced,
ut of
disaf-
right
struc-